

R E M A R K S

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the discussion that follows. Claims 1-42 are pending in this Application. Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,742,904 to Pinder et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,489 to Lichter et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 5,901,214 to Shaffer et al. Claims 3, 17 and 31 have been rejected as being obvious over Pinder et al. in view of Lichter et al. Claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32 and 33 have been rejected as being obvious over Pinder et al. in view of Lichter et al. and Shaffer et al. Claims 6, 7, 9-13, 20, 23-27 and 34-41 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. After a careful review of the claims, it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are therefore traversed.

2. Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 29 and 30 have been rejected as being obvious over Pinder et al. in view of Lichter et al. and Shaffer et al. In response, independent claims 1, 15 and 29 have been amended to make clear that the public safety resource that is selected may be one of many that provide different public services ✓ within the same geographic area. The additional limitation of different public service resources serving overlapping geographic areas is supported by the home security example on page 13, lines

1-19 where police and fire departments provide overlapping coverage within homes. No new matter has been added.

In contrast, none of the cited references of Pinder et al., Lichter et al. or Shaffer et al. teach or suggest the selection of a public service entity based upon a local and an environment of the local. Since none of the references or the combination teach or suggest this particular claim limitation, the rejections are now believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

3. Claims 3, 17 and 31 have been rejected as being obvious over Pinder et al. in view of Lichter et al. However, neither Pinder et al. or Lichter et al. or the combination of Pinder et al. and Lichter teach or suggest the selection of public safety entities that offer different public safety services based upon location and environment. Since the combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation, the rejections are now believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

4. Claims 4, 5, 18, 19, 32 and 33 have been rejected as being obvious over Pinder et al. in view of Lichter et al. and Shaffer et al. However, as demonstrated above, none of the cited references of Pinder et al., Lichter et al. or Shaffer et al. or the combination of Pinder et al., Lichter et al. and Shaffer et al. teach or suggest the selection of a public service entity based

upon a local and an environment of the local. Since the combination fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation, the rejections are now believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

5. Claims 6, 7, 9-13, 20, 23-27 and 34-41 have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 6, 7, 9-13, 20, 23-27 and 34-41 have been rewritten as suggested.

6. Allowance of claims 1-42, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By



Jon P. Christensen  
Registration No. 34,137

January 7, 2004  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500